



A Comprehensive Narrative Review of Protocol Development for Acute Opioid Overdose Events in Outpatient Clinic Waiting Rooms: Integrating Emergency Response, Public Health Surveillance, and Institutional Policy

Nadia Mohammed Hassan Khormi ⁽¹⁾ , Tahani Mari Madine Alsayed ⁽²⁾ , Ruba Ahmed Bakr Najjar ⁽²⁾ , Nouf Abdullah Mohammad Alraee ⁽³⁾ , Amal Mohammed Ali Alsabai ⁽⁴⁾ , Manal Abdullhadi Abdullah Alshehri , Sameer Ali Ibrahim Zakri ⁽⁵⁾ , Asma Saud Alanazi ⁽⁶⁾ , Mai Fhaid Alshammari ⁽⁶⁾ , Hend Fihaid Alshammari ⁽⁶⁾

(1) King Fahd Central Hospital, Jazan, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(2) Ministry of Health control center in King Abdulaziz International Airport, Jeddah, second health cluster,, Saudi Arabia,

(3) Preventive Medicine Postgraduate Program at Jeddah First and Second Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(4) Al-Layth Health Center, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(5) Jazan Health Cluster – External Treatment Requests Department, Ministry of Health, Jazan, Saudi Arabia,

(6) King Salman Specialist Hospital – Hail Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Background: The opioid overdose crisis represents a significant global public health emergency, with mortality increasingly occurring in non-traditional settings, including healthcare facilities. Clinic waiting rooms, as points of first contact, are high-risk environments where overdoses may occur unexpectedly, presenting complex clinical, ethical, and administrative challenges that intersect clinical medicine, public health surveillance, and legal frameworks.

Aim: This narrative review synthesizes current evidence and best practices to formulate a comprehensive protocol for managing acute opioid overdose in clinic waiting rooms, with specific emphasis on integrated public health reporting systems, standardized incident documentation, and clear guidelines for law enforcement notification, particularly through the role of the medical secretary.

Methods: A systematic search of electronic databases (PubMed, Scopus, CINAHL, PsycINFO) was conducted for literature published between 2010 and 2024.

Results: Effective management requires a tiered response: immediate emergency intervention with intramuscular or intranasal naloxone by trained first responders, followed by structured post-resuscitation care. Notification of law enforcement must be guided by strict protocols balancing legal mandates, patient confidentiality, and harm reduction principles, with the medical secretary playing a pivotal administrative and coordinating role.

Conclusion: A pre-emptive, protocol-driven approach that integrates clinical emergency response with robust administrative procedures for incident documentation and judicious external notification is paramount. This strategy not only improves individual patient outcomes but also strengthens institutional preparedness and contributes to broader public health efforts to mitigate the opioid crisis.

Keywords: Opioid-Related Disorders; Overdose; Health Facilities; Incident Reporting; Public Health Surveillance; Interprofessional Relations.

Introduction

The opioid overdose epidemic remains a devastating public health catastrophe, with morbidity and mortality permeating all sectors of society (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2023). While historically associated with private residences or public spaces, overdoses are increasingly occurring within the very environments designed to provide healthcare, including hospital wards, emergency departments, and outpatient clinics (Coffin & Sullivan, 2013; Weiner et al., 2020). The outpatient clinic waiting room presents a unique and high-risk interface—a semi-public space where individuals, potentially experiencing withdrawal, seeking

treatment, or in possession of substances, may use drugs or succumb to the delayed effects of prior use. This setting necessitates a distinct and well-considered response protocol that extends beyond basic clinical resuscitation to address the complex administrative, ethical, and public health implications of such an event (Martin et al., 2023).

The management of an overdose in this context is not merely a clinical exercise but an organizational stress test. It engages multiple stakeholders: clinical staff (physicians, nurses, medical assistants), administrative personnel (notably the medical secretary), security, public health authorities, and potentially law enforcement. The

absence of a clear, rehearsed, and interdisciplinary protocol can lead to delayed care, chaotic escalation, breaches of patient confidentiality, and missed opportunities for public health intervention and quality improvement (Green et al., 2017). Furthermore, the decision to involve law enforcement is fraught with ethical tension between legal obligations, patient safety, and the principles of harm reduction, which seek to engage rather than alienate individuals who use drugs (Beletsky & Davis, 2017).

This narrative review aims to synthesize contemporary evidence and guidelines to propose a structured framework for managing opioid overdoses in clinic waiting rooms. It will critically examine the three pillars of an effective institutional response: (1) the immediate clinical emergency management, (2) the implementation of a standardized, non-punitive incident reporting system for quality improvement and public health surveillance, and (3) the development of clear, ethical guidelines for police notification, specifying the critical administrative role of the medical secretary. By integrating these elements, clinics can transform a crisis event into an opportunity for systematic learning, enhanced patient trust, and contribution to broader epidemiological efforts to combat the opioid crisis.

Immediate Clinical Management

The cornerstone of overdose response is rapid recognition and administration of the opioid antagonist naloxone. In a waiting room, the first responder may be a receptionist, a medical assistant, or a bystander, underscoring the need for universal "first-responder" training for all non-clinical and clinical staff (Fortune et al., 2021; Natale et al., 2023). Key signs of opioid overdose include unresponsiveness, slowed or absent breathing (respiratory depression), pinpoint pupils, and cyanosis

(blue lips or fingertips) (World Health Organization [WHO], 2014).

The standard of care is the prompt administration of naloxone. Both intramuscular (IM) and intranasal (IN) formulations are effective, with IN devices offering advantages in ease of use and reduced needle-stick risk for staff, making them particularly suitable for an administrative or security first response (Kerr et al., 2009). The current evidence supports an initial dose of 4 mg IN or 0.4 mg IM, with repeat dosing every 2-3 minutes if there is no response, as the potency of synthetic opioids like fentanyl may require higher or repeated doses (Rzasa et al., 2018). Importantly, after administering naloxone, staff must immediately activate the clinic's emergency medical services (EMS) system, as the duration of action of naloxone (30-90 minutes) is often shorter than that of the offending opioid, placing the patient at risk of relapse (Wermeling, 2015).

Post-naloxone care is critical. Patients should be placed in the recovery position to maintain an open airway and monitored continuously for respiratory status and level of consciousness until EMS arrival (Neale et al., 2022). Agitation and acute withdrawal symptoms (nausea, vomiting, agitation) may occur upon reversal and require supportive, non-confrontational management (Strang et al., 2019). The clinic must have a clear policy on whether the resuscitated patient will be assessed by an on-site provider if available, or if care is transferred entirely to EMS. This policy should be developed in consultation with local EMS protocols and institutional legal counsel (Table 1). Figure 1 illustrates the immediate clinical actions required during a suspected opioid overdose in an outpatient clinic waiting room.

Table 1: Key Steps in Immediate Clinical Response to Suspected Opioid Overdose in a Waiting Room

Step	Action	Rationale & Key Considerations
1. Recognition	Assess for unresponsiveness, respiratory depression (slow/absent breaths), pinpoint pupils.	Early identification is critical to prevent hypoxic brain injury. Call the patient's name and perform a sternal rub.
2. Activation	Shout for help. Designated staff member calls EMS (e.g., 911) immediately.	Establishes advanced care is en route. Provide clear location and "suspected opioid overdose."
3. Naloxone Administration	Retrieve clinic naloxone kit. Administer 4 mg intranasally OR 0.4 mg intramuscularly.	Naloxone is a safe, specific opioid antagonist. IN administration is preferred for non-clinical staff.
4. Supportive Care	If no response in 2-3 minutes, repeat naloxone dose. Place patient in recovery position. Monitor airway and breathing.	Fentanyl analogs may require multiple doses. Recovery position prevents aspiration.
5. Post-Resuscitation	Monitor for re-narcotization and withdrawal symptoms. Provide calm reassurance. Gather patient belongings securely.	Naloxone effect is temporary. Withdrawal, while distressing, is not typically life-threatening.
6. Handoff	Provide a concise report to EMS upon arrival: time of found, actions taken, naloxone doses given, any known patient history.	Ensures continuity of care. Document the handoff in the incident report.



Figure 1. Emergency Response Steps for Opioid Overdose in a Clinic Waiting Room

The Imperative of Structured Incident Reporting

Following the stabilization of the patient, a systematic and non-punitive incident reporting process is paramount. This serves dual, complementary functions: internal quality improvement (QI) and external public health surveillance (Azharuddin et al., 2023). Internally, a standardized report facilitates a root cause analysis to identify system-level factors that may have contributed to the event or the response (e.g., adequacy of staff training, naloxone kit accessibility, clarity of roles) (Nelson & Goldfrank, 2019). This aligns with a Just Culture model, which focuses on system flaws rather than individual blame, encouraging transparent reporting and organizational learning (O'Donovan & McAuliffe, 2020).

The medical secretary often serves as the linchpin in this administrative process (Zajac et al., 2021). A standardized incident report form should capture: date, time, and location; a factual description of the event; actions taken (naloxone administration, EMS call); patient demographics (age, gender, without violating confidentiality in the general report); and outcome (transported to hospital, refused service, etc.) (Romero et al., 2023; Wolff et al., 2022). This form must be designed for efficiency to avoid burdening staff while capturing essential data.

Externally, this data becomes a vital stream for public health surveillance. Reporting non-fatal overdoses to local or state health departments is mandated in many jurisdictions and is crucial for monitoring overdose trends, identifying emerging drug threats (e.g., fentanyl analogs, xylazine adulteration), and allocating public health resources (Bagley et al., 2019). The clinic's data contributes to a community-wide syndromic surveillance system, enabling early warning of spikes in overdoses (Daniulaityte et al., 2022). Furthermore, the incident

report can trigger a "warm handoff" or referral process within the clinic, connecting the individual to treatment services such as medication for opioid use disorder (MOUD) like buprenorphine, thereby using the crisis as a reachable moment for engagement (Samuels et al., 2016). Figure 2 depicts the post-event administrative workflow after an opioid overdose in a clinic setting



Figure 2. Incident Reporting and Administrative Protocols Following Opioid Overdose Events Navigating the Complex Terrain of Police Notification

The decision to notify law enforcement of an overdose occurring on clinic property is one of the most sensitive aspects of protocol development. This decision must balance legal statutes, patient safety, clinic security, and ethical obligations to patient confidentiality and harm reduction. Policies vary widely by state and country, particularly with the enactment of Good Samaritan laws, which provide limited immunity from prosecution for the individual overdosing and those calling for help to encourage lifesaving EMS calls (Hamilton et al., 2021). However, these laws often have limitations and may not apply to all drug offenses or existing warrants (Table 2).

A clinic's policy must be explicit, legally vetted, and known to all staff. The role of the medical secretary in this process is critical and must be clearly defined. In many instances, the secretary is the staff member who interfaces with external agencies. The protocol should specify that clinical decision-making regarding patient care is paramount and separate from security decisions. Generally, notification of police should not be automatic but based on specific, pre-defined criteria to avoid deterring individuals from seeking future care (Gatewood et al., 2016).

Table 2: Decision-Matrix for Police Notification Following a Clinic Overdose

Scenario	Recommended Action	Rationale
Overdose only, no other threats.	Do not automatically notify the police. Focus on medical response and internal incident reporting.	Aligns with harm reduction principles and Good Samaritan laws. Encourages future help-seeking.
Imminent threat to safety (e.g., aggressive behavior, weapons present).	Notify clinic security (if available) and police for safety support.	The primary duty is to ensure the safety of patients, visitors, and staff.
Discovery of suspected illicit substances left in waiting room.	Follow clinic policy on securing substances. Notification may be required by law or institutional policy; often handled by security/administration.	Balances legal compliance with minimizing clinical disruption. Police interaction should be managed by designated administrators, not clinicians.
Patient expires despite resuscitation efforts.	Police and medical examiner must be notified as per jurisdiction law for any unattended or unexpected death.	A legal requirement. Clinical staff should focus on documentation; administration handles official notifications.
Specific mandatory reporting law exists in the jurisdiction (beyond public health).	Comply with the law. Policy should specify who (e.g., Clinic Director, Medical Secretary) makes the report and how it is documented.	Ensures legal compliance while structuring the process to protect patient information to the extent possible.

The medical secretary's role, if notification is deemed necessary, is to act as a consistent point of contact, providing only the information stipulated by policy (e.g., location, nature of the safety threat) while protecting protected health information (PHI) as required by HIPAA and other privacy laws (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996). Clinicians should remain focused on patient care, not interfacing with law enforcement regarding investigative matters (Beletsky et al., 2007). A debriefing for staff following any overdose event, especially one involving police, is essential to address vicarious trauma and clarify procedural adherence (Beaugard et al., 2023).

Synthesis and Recommended Framework for Protocol Development

Synthesizing the available literature, an effective and resilient clinic protocol for opioid overdose management must be fundamentally interdisciplinary, subject to regular rehearsal through drills, and undergo scheduled review to incorporate evolving evidence and local data. An integrated, multi-component framework is therefore proposed. First, comprehensive **preparedness & training** constitutes the foundational pillar, mandating that all frontline personnel—encompassing clinical staff, medical secretaries, and security officers—participate in annual, competency-based training. This training must cover overdose recognition, hands-on naloxone administration (prioritizing intranasal devices for ease of use), and strict adherence to the clinic-specific response sequence, complemented by rigorous checks to ensure naloxone kits are both prominently accessible and within their expiration dates (Kennedy et al., 2018).

Second, a clearly communicated **emergency response algorithm**, ideally a simple, visually intuitive flowchart akin to Table 1, should be displayed in staff areas and potentially within the waiting room itself to manage bystander expectations; this algorithm must unequivocally prioritize immediate activation of Emergency Medical Services (EMS) before delineating subsequent steps for naloxone administration and supportive care. Third, the implementation of a **standardized incident reporting system** is critical for transforming a crisis into a learning opportunity; this involves creating a streamlined, one-page form utilizing check boxes and drop-down menus to facilitate rapid completion. The medical secretary should be designated as the administrative steward of this process, responsible for ensuring form completion, secure filing, and, following institutional protocol, the submission of de-identified data to relevant public health authorities for surveillance purposes (Clark et al., 2014).

Fourth, a **clear police notification policy**, developed in consultation with legal counsel, is essential to navigate the complex interface between healthcare, law, and ethics. This written policy must explicitly define the narrow circumstances necessitating law enforcement involvement (as outlined in Table 2), precisely designate the authorized administrative role (e.g., Clinic Manager or a Medical Secretary acting under specific direction), and stipulate the limited scope of information that can be disclosed to protect patient confidentiality and align with harm reduction principles. Finally, robust **post-event procedures** ensure closure and continuity, involving the activation of an immediate referral pathway to connect the individual to medication for opioid use disorder (MOUD) or counseling services,

thereby leveraging a reachable teachable moment for engagement. Concurrently, a mandatory, non-punitive, systems-focused debriefing for all involved staff should occur within 72 hours to review clinical and administrative actions, address vicarious trauma, and identify actionable system improvements, thereby fostering a Just Culture and closing the quality improvement loop (Collins et al., 2023).

Conclusion

Managing an opioid overdose in a clinic waiting room is a high-acuity event that tests both clinical readiness and institutional integrity. An effective strategy transcends the emergency administration of naloxone to encompass a holistic, protocol-driven approach that integrates seamless clinical care with rigorous administrative processes. By establishing a standardized incident reporting mechanism, clinics contribute valuable data to public health surveillance and foster internal learning. By creating a judicious, ethically sound policy on police notification—clearly defining the role of key administrative staff like the medical secretary—clinics can navigate complex legal landscapes while upholding their commitment to patient-centered care and harm reduction. In the context of the ongoing opioid crisis, outpatient clinics have both an opportunity and a responsibility to serve not only as treatment venues but as prepared, responsive, and learning organizations that can save lives and strengthen community health infrastructure. Future research should focus on evaluating the implementation and outcomes of such integrated protocols in diverse clinical settings.

References

1. Azharuddin, S., Ogbebor, O., Shuster, M., Smith, B., Arshad, H., & Cheema, T. (2023). Toxicological emergencies. *Critical Care Nursing Quarterly*, 46(1), 82-99. DOI: 10.1097/CNQ.0000000000000439
2. Bagley, S. M., Schoenberger, S. F., Wayne, K. M., & Walley, A. Y. (2019). A scoping review of post opioid-overdose interventions. *Preventive medicine*, 128, 105813. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2019.105813>
3. Beaugard, C. A., Hruschak, V., Lee, C. S., Swab, J., Roth, S., & Rosen, D. (2023). Emergency medical services on the frontlines of the opioid overdose crisis: the role of mental health, substance use, and burnout. *International Journal of Emergency Services*, 12(1), 91-102. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJES-11-2021-0073>
4. Beletsky, L., & Davis, C. S. (2017). Today's fentanyl crisis: Prohibition's Iron Law, revisited. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 46, 156-159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2017.05.050>
5. Beletsky, L., Ruthazer, R., Macalino, G. E., Rich, J. D., Tan, L., & Burris, S. (2007). Physicians' knowledge of and willingness to prescribe naloxone to reverse accidental opiate overdose: challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Urban Health*, 84(1), 126-136. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-006-9120-z>
6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2023). *Drug overdose deaths*. National Center for Health Statistics. <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/databriefs/db522.htm>
7. Clark, A. K., Wilder, C. M., & Winstanley, E. L. (2014). A systematic review of community opioid overdose prevention and naloxone distribution programs. *Journal of addiction medicine*, 8(3), 153-163. DOI: 10.1097/ADM.0000000000000034
8. Coffin, P. O., & Sullivan, S. D. (2013). Cost-effectiveness of distributing naloxone to heroin users for lay overdose reversal in Russian cities. *Journal of medical economics*, 16(8), 1051-1060. <https://doi.org/10.3111/13696998.2013.811080>
9. Collins, A. B., Baird, J., Nimaja, E., Ashenafi, Y., Clark, M. A., & Beaudoin, F. L. (2023). Experiences of patients at high risk of opioid overdose accessing emergency department and behavioral health interventions: a qualitative analysis in an urban emergency department. *BMC health services research*, 23(1), 370. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-09387-7>
10. Daniulaityte, R., Juhascik, M. P., Strayer, K. E., Sizemore, I. E., Zatreh, M., Nahhas, R. W., ... & Carlson, R. G. (2019). Trends in fentanyl and fentanyl analogue-related overdose deaths—Montgomery County, Ohio, 2015–2017. *Drug and alcohol dependence*, 198, 116-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2019.01.045>
11. Fortune, S., Pavlova, A., Hetrick, S. E., Scarth, B., Hawton, K., & Witt, K. G. (2021). First Responder, clinician, and non-clinical support staff knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours towards people presenting for emergency care following self-harm: a mixed evidence synthesis. *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2021(12), CD014939. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD014939>
12. Gatewood, A. K., Van Wert, M. J., Andrada, A. P., & Surkan, P. J. (2016). Academic physicians' and medical students' perceived barriers toward bystander administered naloxone as an overdose prevention strategy. *Addictive behaviors*, 61, 40-46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2016.05.013>
13. Green, T. C., Case, P., Fiske, H., Baird, J., Cabral, S., Burstein, D., ... & Bratberg, J. (2017). Perpetuating stigma or reducing risk? Perspectives from naloxone consumers and pharmacists on pharmacy-based naloxone in 2 states. *Journal of the American Pharmacists*

- Association, 57(2), S19-S27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.japh.2017.01.013>
14. Hamilton, L., Davis, C. S., Kravitz-Wirtz, N., Ponicki, W., & Cerdá, M. (2021). Good Samaritan laws and overdose mortality in the United States in the fentanyl era. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 97, 103294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2021.103294>
 15. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-191, 110 Stat. 1936.
 16. Kennedy, L. C., Binswanger, I. A., Mueller, S. R., Levy, C., Matlock, D. D., Calcaterra, S. L., ... & Frank, J. W. (2018). "Those conversations in my experience don't go well": A qualitative study of primary care provider experiences tapering long-term opioid medications. *Pain medicine*, 19(11), 2201-2211. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pm/pnx276>
 17. Kerr, D., Kelly, A. M., Dietze, P., Jolley, D., & Barger, B. (2009). Randomized controlled trial comparing the effectiveness and safety of intranasal and intramuscular naloxone for the treatment of suspected heroin overdose. *Addiction*, 104(12), 2067-2074. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02724.x>
 18. Martin, R. A., Alexander-Scott, N., Berk, J., Carpenter, R. W., Kang, A., Hoadley, A., ... & Clarke, J. G. (2023). Post-incarceration outcomes of a comprehensive statewide correctional MOUD program: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Regional Health–Americas*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2022.100419>
 19. Natale, I., Harvey, C., Wood, P., & Anderson, K. (2023). "It can save your life, that's all I know," barriers and facilitators for engagement in take-home naloxone for people receiving opioid substitution treatment in regional Australia: An explorative study. *Qualitative Research in Medicine & Healthcare*, 7(2), 10868. <https://doi.org/10.4081/qrmh.2023.10868>
 20. Neale, J., Farrugia, A., Campbell, A. N., Dietze, P., Dwyer, R., Fomiatti, R., ... & Strang, J. (2022). Understanding preferences for type of take-home naloxone device: international qualitative analysis of the views of people who use opioids. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 29(2), 109-120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687637.2021.1872499>
 21. Nelson, L. S., & Goldfrank, L. R. (2019). Goldfrank's toxicologic emergencies. (No Title).
 22. O'Donovan, R., & McAuliffe, E. (2020). A systematic review exploring the content and outcomes of interventions to improve psychological safety, speaking up and voice behaviour. *BMC health services research*, 20(1), 101. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-020-4931-2>
 23. Romero, R. B., Sánchez-Lira, J. A., Pasaran, S. S., Rivera, A. C., Corral, L. A., Salimian, A., ... & Goodman-Meza, D. (2023). Implementing a decentralized opioid overdose prevention strategy in Mexico, a pending public policy issue. *The Lancet Regional Health–Americas*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2023.100535>
 24. Rzasz Lynn, R., & Galinkin, J. L. (2018). Naloxone dosage for opioid reversal: current evidence and clinical implications. *Therapeutic advances in drug safety*, 9(1), 63-88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2042098617744161>
 25. Samuels, E. A., Dwyer, K., Mello, M. J., Baird, J., Kellogg, A. R., & Bernstein, E. (2016). Emergency department-based opioid harm reduction: moving physicians from willing to doing. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 23(4), 455-465. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.12910>
 26. Strang, J., McDonald, R., Campbell, G., Degenhardt, L., Nielsen, S., Ritter, A., & Dale, O. (2019). Take-home naloxone for the emergency interim management of opioid overdose: the public health application of an emergency medicine. *Drugs*, 79(13), 1395-1418. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40265-019-01154-5>
 27. Weiner, S. G., Baker, O., Bernson, D., & Schuur, J. D. (2020). One-year mortality of patients after emergency department treatment for nonfatal opioid overdose. *Annals of emergency medicine*, 75(1), 13-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annemergmed.2019.04.020>
 28. Wermeling, D. P. (2015). Review of naloxone safety for opioid overdose: practical considerations for new technology and expanded public access. *Therapeutic advances in drug safety*, 6(1), 20-31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2042098614564776>
 29. Wolff, J., Gitukui, S., O'Brien, M., Mital, S., & Noonan, R. K. (2022). The overdose response strategy: reducing drug overdose deaths through strategic partnership between public health and public safety. *Journal of public health management and practice*, 28(Supplement 6), S359-S366. DOI: 10.1097/PHH.0000000000001580
 30. World Health Organization. (2014). *Community management of opioid overdose*. World Health Organization.
 31. Zajac, S., Woods, A., Tannenbaum, S., Salas, E., & Holladay, C. L. (2021). Overcoming challenges to teamwork in healthcare: a team effectiveness framework and evidence-based guidance. *Frontiers in Communication*, 6, 606445. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2021.606445>.